



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Bradford manuscript has had a curious history. Bradford left it to his son and for some years it continued in the possession of the Bradford descendants, but after having been used by three or four early historical writers it disappeared. In 1855 it was discovered in the library of the Bishop of London, probably having been carried to England by Governor Hutchinson, who was using it in the preparation of his history of Massachusetts Bay.

A copy was made for the Massachusetts Historical Society and edited by Charles Deane, was printed in the collections of that society in 1856. In this form it has long been known to historical students having access to the larger libraries. The State of Massachusetts made several unsuccessful attempts to recover the manuscript, but was not finally successful until 1897, and in the following year the manuscript and an account of the proceedings incident to its delivery were published by the State.

The present volume is based on the Massachusetts reprint and has the advantage of Mr. Davis' careful editing and an interesting introductory chapter. It is hardly necessary to comment on the importance of Governor Bradford's history for "without it the history of the Plymouth Colony, now so complete, would have been, so far as its early years are concerned, involved in mystery." The story is interestingly and quaintly told by Bradford, and we are fortunate in having it now in usable and convenient form and at a price within the reach of all.

—EDWARD McMAHON.

Alexander H. Stephens. By Louis Pendleton. [The American Crisis Biographies, edited by Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer.] (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs, 1908, pp. 406.)

One who expects to find in this volume a new life of Alexander H. Stephens is destined to disappointment. The volume is a scissors-and-pastepot condensation of two earlier biographies of Stephens, together with a few selections or condensations from Stephens' "War Between the States." Practically the only parts contributed by the author are three chapters in which, as "a fellow Georgian," he tells the reader some things he thinks the reader ought to know, not that they have any direct bearing on Stephens' character or actions, but apparently on the theory that they should be known.

The first biography of Stephens came from the pen of Henry Cleveland in 1866, and is a meagre account, chiefly valuable for

the letters and speeches it contains. This was followed by a better and longer sketch, written by Stephens' two friends Johnson and Browne, and like the earlier volume, was written while Stephens was living. In fact, the first edition of Johnson and Browne was read in manuscript by Stephens. A later edition (1878), after his death, is substantially the same work with supplementary chapters dealing with his last years, his death, and the eulogies delivered in that connection. Manifestly these volumes have little value in giving a perspective estimate of the man, and are more eulogistic than discriminating.

In a work appearing a generation after Stephens' death we have a right to expect that these faults be eliminated, but this volume in no sense meets the expectation. It is almost within the bounds of truth to say that this work is simply a brief rehash of Johnson and Browne's volume. The author seems utterly ignorant of the fact that the Missouri Compromise had no bearing on territory acquired after the compromise was made, for in his view the Wilmot proviso "openly violated the covenant of the Missouri Compromise" (92). In answer to the complaints made at the time that the Kansas-Nebraska bill "abrogated the Missouri Compromise" we are informed that that compromise "was abrogated, though the fact was not officially stated, when the compromise measures of 1850 were adopted through the influence of Clay and Webster" (132).

To judge by this book alone Mr. Pendleton has no conception of the canons of historical writing. Time after time letters of Stephens' are summarized, no reference is given, and the reader is left to conclude that the letters themselves have been consulted. One has only to turn to the older works on Stephens to find the same letters summarized in almost exactly the same words. A letter quoted (99) from Waddell's *Life of Linton Stephens* is given in Johnson and Browne (251) in a distinctly different form and one is tempted to believe that Mr. Pendleton did not see any of Stephens' letters, but has copied them bodily from other sources in many cases without due credit. In this connection it is worth noting that not a single reference is made to the *Congressional Globe* for Stephens' speeches, all of them being cited from the older biographies which are out of print.

The three chapters not compiled from the older biographies of Stephens are chapters VII, XI and most of XII. The seventh deals with "nullification at the North," in which the author sets forth at length the practical nullification of the Fugitive Slave Act by the various Northern States, and shows that the radical

abolitionists were opposed to the constitution and the Union. Chapter XI, entitled "Seventy Years of Dis-union," is a defense of secession, in which the author, beginning with the colonial period, traces the growth of centralization and cites abundant evidence to show that the fathers held the view that the Union was composed of sovereign States and that the constitution was a compact under which each State reserved its sovereign rights. The Virginia and the Kentucky resolutions, the New England conspiracy of 1803-4, Burr's conspiracy, the Hartford convention, Georgia's defiance of the Federal government, and other less important instances of like character are discussed to prove that secession and nullification were contemplated by many persons and sections before the Southerners made the final attempt following Lincoln's election. The thirteenth chapter deals with the "South's handicaps in the war" and shows that one of these was Stephens himself. His opposition to Davis' policies grew as the war went on and was the outgrowth of his constitutional opposition to the centralization of power in Davis' hands, and to what Stephens believed to be unwise and illegal action of the government in carrying out its war policy. Mr. Pendleton has made an endeavor to throw new light on Stephens' character by a search in the contemporary newspapers of Georgia, but no important information has been discovered.

On the whole the publishers have a certain justification in reprinting the most important parts of the earlier lives of Stephens which are now out of print, but it would have been better to have called this volume a reprint or condensation with notes by Mr. Pendleton. In any other guise the book is sailing under false colors. The bibliography appended is worthless.

—EDWARD McMAHON.

Stephen A. Douglas: A Study in American Politics. By Allen Johnson. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1908, pp. 503.)

When Stephen A. Douglas died in Chicago forty-seven years ago the Chicago Tribune said editorially, "That the place which the departed statesman occupied in the National Councils can not, in any true sense, be filled, all will agree." Four days later in an estimate of him the same paper said, "No man has died in many a decade whose death will be so widely felt as that of him whose body was yesterday borne through our streets. * * * He was the Democratic party of the North. * * * His under-